



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

mony with what we conceive to have been the original meaning of the Logion. For example, Dalman's rendering of the two words, which makes **DNK** its starting-point, would suit our emendation of the text quite as well as it suits Dalman's own interpretation.³

When we remind ourselves of the frequency with which the phrase 'the Kingdom of Heaven' occurred in the reports of the Master's discourses, we realize how easy it would be for some early scribe to mistake a chance occurrence of words in some measure similar for just another instance of the great phrase that so frequently recurred.

It is significant, as affording some corroboration of our hypothesis, that in Matt. 12, 29 Jesus uses the verb ἀρπάζω of plundering the goods of the Strong Man — the very verb employed in our Logion, as we interpret it, to describe the successful onset of the new forces of righteousness upon the Kingdom of Satan.

J. HUGH MICHAEL.

VICTORIA COLLEGE,
TORONTO, CANADA.

THE TEXT OF LUKE II, 22

This verse contains a textual problem which has perplexed editors of the New Testament since the days of Erasmus and the Complutensian edition. The question is, What pronoun should be read after καθαρισμοῦ? — αὐτῶν, or αὐτοῦ, or αὐτῆς?

Αὐτῶν is attested by **ABLWΓΔΠ** etc., by nearly all the minuscules, by the Peshitta, the Harelean, and the Palestinian Syriac, and by three minor ancient versions (Ethiopic, Armenian, and Gothic). The Arabic Diatessaron also has the plural pronoun, agreeing with the Peshitta at this point. Origen found αὐτῶν in his text of the Gospel, and, so far as is known, he was acquainted with no other reading in this place. He quotes Luke 2, 22 in his Fourteenth Homily on Luke, which deals with the Circumcision and Purification, and he discusses the difficulty involved in the plural αὐτῶν without mentioning any variant reading. If he had known of such, he would certainly have made some reference to it. The Homiliae in Lucam were written at Caesarea, after Origen's withdrawal to that city from Alexandria in the year 231. We may therefore assume that αὐτῶν formed part of Luke 2, 22 in the text current at Caesarea and Alexandria in the early

³ *The Words of Jesus* (English Translation), pp. 141, 142.

part of the third century, and that there were no rival claimants for the place. It was also the Antiochian, or 'Syrian,' reading, as its predominance in the minuscule manuscripts proves.

Αὐτῶν is sometimes explained as referring to the Jews.¹ But this is contextually objectionable, because the subject understood of *ἀνγγαγον* is the parents of Jesus. Moreover, this interpretation becomes much more difficult, not to say impossible, if one believes, as the present writer does, that the first two chapters of Luke (except the preface) are based on a Semitic original. Some think the plural pronoun is used of Mary and Jesus;² whilst others, with much better reason in view of the context, refer *αὐτῶν* to Joseph and Mary.³ But both of these explanations are fraught with the difficulty that the Mosaic Law prescribed purification only for the mother after childbirth. No ceremonial impurity attached to the father or to the child.

The feminine pronoun *αὐτῆς* is found in no Greek manuscript of the New Testament.⁴ Its attestation is not only of inferior quality; it is also extremely scanty, being limited to a citation in a work wrongly ascribed to Athanasius,⁵ to a catena on the Gospel,⁶ and to Erpenius's edition of the Arabic published in 1616.⁷ *Αὐτῆς* is obviously a learned correction either of the reading *αὐτῶν* or of the variant *αὐτοῦ*, which is discussed below. It was made by some one who knew that the woman only according to the Jewish Law needed purification after the birth of a child.

On the other hand Codex Bezae and at least eight minuscules have *αὐτοῦ* after *καθαρισμοῦ*.⁸ The Sahidic version and the Amsterdam edition of the Armenian also have 'his cleansing' here.⁹ *Eius* of the Old Latin¹⁰ and the Vulgate, as well as the pronominal suffix in the Sinaitic Syriac,¹¹ are ambiguous; they may be interpreted either as masculine or as feminine. But inasmuch as *αὐτοῦ* is an early 'Western' reading, being found in Codex Bezae and the Sahidic version, whereas *αὐτῆς* is very slightly attested and is doubtless only a learned correction of *αὐτῶν* or *αὐτοῦ*, it seems altogether probable that *αὐτοῦ* rather than *αὐτῆς* underlies the Old Latin and the Sinaitic Syriac. For the Old Latin and Old Syriac versions were made from manuscripts of the 'Western' type. Moreover, there is no evidence that the reading *αὐτῆς* was in existence when either of these versions was made. It is quite possible, however, that many readers of the Old Latin and Sinaitic Syriac understood the mother of Christ to be meant. *Αὐτοῦ* can only refer to Jesus, whose circumcision and naming are recounted in verse 21. But from the point of view of the Mosaic

* See notes at the end of the article.

Law it is erroneous to speak of the purification of the child. Nevertheless, Griesbach regarded *αὐτοῦ* as a *speciosa lectio*, and Zahn thinks that it may be the right reading in Luke 2, 22.¹²

A few authorities have no pronoun at all after *καθαρισμοῦ*.¹³ The omission undoubtedly arose from a feeling that the Evangelist could not have written either *αὐτῶν* or *αὐτοῦ* in this place. This reading, however, has no more claim to be regarded as correct than the feminine pronoun *αὐτῆς*.

The Complutensian editors,¹⁴ followed by Beza and the Elzevir editions, adopted *αὐτῆς*;¹⁵ but Erasmus and Stephanus printed *αὐτῶν* in their New Testaments.¹⁶ The Antwerp and Paris Polyglots adhere to the Elzevir tradition, whereas the London Polyglot reproduces the text of Stephanus. *Αὐτῶν* is read by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Westcott and Hort, Baljon, and von Soden. No editor has ever adopted *αὐτοῦ*, and none since Alter has printed *αὐτῆς*.

The present writer believes that the first two chapters of Luke (except the preface) are based on a Semitic source. The Greek variants in Luke 2, 22 can be readily explained if one assumes, with Bousset, Gressmann, Plummer, and Moffatt, that the underlying document was written in Aramaic; and this assumption seems reasonable at least so far as the narrative parts of the chapters are concerned.¹⁷

The source in Luke 2, 22, like the Targum of Onkelos on Lev. 12, 4 and 6, probably had *יומי רכותה*. The suffix in *רכותה* was intended to be read as feminine, meaning 'her purification.' Luke, or whoever translated the source into Greek, having read in the preceding verse about the circumcision and naming of Jesus, took it as masculine, 'his purification,' and translated it by *καθαρισμοῦ αὐτοῦ*. This was the original text of Luke 2, 22. But before the time of Origen it was perceived that *αὐτοῦ* could not be right, and it was changed to *αὐτῶν*, which was suggested by the verb *ἀνήγαγον* and seemed to improve the sense. In course of time *αὐτῶν* became the dominant reading, though *αὐτοῦ* survived in texts which preserved the 'Western' tradition. But neither *αὐτοῦ* nor *αὐτῶν* was universally satisfactory, since the Mosaic Law demanded purification of the woman after childbirth and of her only. Accordingly *αὐτῆς* appeared as a learned correction, but its range was extremely limited until the appearance of the Complutensian edition in 1522. The adoption of *αὐτῆς* into the text of several early printed editions of the New Testament is due in part to the Vulgate *eius*, which was understood as a feminine pronoun.

NOTES

1. So Mill (*Novum Testamentum*, ed. Kuster, Prol. §§ 676 and 1438); van Hengel (Annotations, p. 199); Edersheim (Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah, 8th ed., i, p. 195, n. 1).

2. So Origen; de Wette; Winer (Grammar, tr. Thayer, p. 147); Hahn.

3. So Meyer, Godet, Alford, Bernhard Weiss, Schanz, Plummer, E. Klossermann.

4. Codex 76, a Vienna manuscript of the twelfth or thirteenth century, is commonly cited as a witness for *αὐτῆς*. This, however, is an error; for Gregory, who examined the codex in 1887, reports that it reads *αὐτῶν* in Luke 2, 22 (cf. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*, III, 484). Codex 76 is one of the manuscripts consulted by Alter. He printed *αὐτῆς* in Luke 2, 22 without recording the reading of this codex. Griesbach inferred from Alter's silence that *αὐτῆς* was found in 76, and in order to indicate that the citation was based on inference he enclosed the number 76 in parentheses. It has been pointed out above that this manuscript really has *αὐτῶν*; and Alter failed to indicate this fact through carelessness. His edition is substantially a reprint of 218, a thirteenth century codex in the Imperial Library in Vienna. Professor Karl Beth, of Vienna, has kindly informed me that it reads *αὐτῶν* in Luke 2, 22. Alter, a Roman Catholic scholar, no doubt adopted *αὐτῆς* from the Complutensian-Elzevir tradition, or possibly from the Vulgate *eius*. Scholz, with characteristic inaccuracy, omitted Griesbach's parentheses about 76, and thenceforth *αὐτῆς* passed into the critical tradition as the true reading of the manuscript.

5. Athanasius (Benedictine ed., Paris, 1698), ii, 418 f.

6. Cf. Cramer, *Catenae*, ii, p. 22. Augustine's *De Consensu Evangelistarum*, ii, 17 is cited by Tischendorf as an authority for *eius*. The passage runs thus: *dies purgationis matris eius* (Benedictine ed., Paris, 1679-1701, iii, col. 38).

7. The Roman edition of the Arabic has no pronoun at this point.

8. Codd. 21, 47, 56, 61, 118, 209, 220, 254.

9. Two Sahidic manuscripts, however, read 'their,' in agreement with NAB etc. The Amsterdam edition of the Armenian version (1666) is in some places conformed to the Latin Vulgate (cf. Conybeare in Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible, i, 154). Accordingly 'his cleansing' in Luke 2, 22 may be due to *purgationis eius* of the Vulgate. Zohrab's critical edition of the New Testament (1789) has 'their cleansing.'

10. The only Latin authorities known to read *eorum* are q and δ.

11. The Curetonian Syriac is defective at this point.

12. Cf. Zahn, *Kommentar*, p. 151, note.

13. Cod. 435, Scrivener's x and y, Amphiloehius (Migne P. G. XXXIX, 48), the Latin translation of Irenaeus (Migne P. G. VII, 877 f.), the Bohairic version (though six manuscripts have 'their'), and the Roman edition of the Arabic.

14. What manuscripts the Complutensian editors used in preparing their edition of the New Testament is not known. It is, however, altogether improbable that they had any Greek authority for *αὐτῆς* in Luke 2, 22. They doubtless introduced the word into their text on the strength of the Vulgate *eius* (understood as a feminine pronoun), just as they adopted 1 John 5, 7

and 8 from the current Latin version. In support of *αὐτῆς* Mill cites the *Lectiones Velestianae*. On these readings, which were really not Greek but Latin, see Wettstein, *Novum Testamentum*, I, pp. 59 ff.

15. 'Her purification' of the A. V. represents this tradition. The R. V. on the other hand reads 'their purification' in accordance with the great uncial manuscripts. Luther wrote 'ihrer Reinigung,' which is ambiguous; but Gerbelius's edition of the New Testament (1521, an Erasmian text), which Luther is said to have used, has *αὐτῶν*. A similar ambiguity is found in the West Saxon and Northumbrian versions.

16. According to Mill, Erasmus was acquainted with one manuscript that read *αὐτοῦ*.

17. The hymns on the other hand are Hebraic in character, and may have been composed in Hebrew. Cf. Torrey, in *Studies in the History of Religions*, presented to C. H. Toy, pp. 293 f. Professor Torrey thinks that the prose setting as well as the hymns themselves were written in Hebrew, and in support of this view he cites the awkward phrase *εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα* in Luke 1, 39. This he regards as an attempt to translate the Hebrew *אֶל מְדִינַת יְהוּדָה* into Greek. "For the Aramaic *מדינתא יהודא* would hardly have been rendered by *εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα*. The word *יהוד* could not well have been misunderstood; moreover, it does not look like the name of a town, nor would it have been transliterated by *Ιουδα*" (*op. cit.*, p. 292). *יהוד* is found in the Aramaic sections of Ezra and Daniel, but *יהודה* occurs a number of times in the Targum on the Prophets as the name of the Southern Kingdom. *Εἰς πόλιν Ἰούδα* may therefore represent the Aramaic *למדינת יהודה* or *למדינתא די יהודה*. Similarly, Torrey thinks that *προβεβηκότες ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτῶν* in Luke 1, 7 is a translation of *באִים בַּיּוֹמִים הַזֵּה*. But the original may quite as well have been *עללן בַּיּוֹמִיהֶן הַזֵּה*. On *a priori* grounds it is more likely that a prose writing which circulated among the Jewish Christians of Palestine should be written in the vernacular Aramaic than in the sacred Hebrew, which was to most of them a *lingua ignota*. Certainly the first part of Acts is based on Aramaic, not Hebrew, sources. Cf. Torrey, *The Date and Composition of Acts*, *passim*.

W. H. P. HATCH.

THE EPISCOPAL THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL
CAMBRIDGE, MASS.